

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,048	AUSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	1732	

All Participants:

(1) Mark Eashoo.

(2) William Bond.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 December 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
that of record

Claims discussed:
those pending

Prior art documents discussed:
that of record


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ex. Eashoo noted that the claim 20 as amended by applicant were still readable over minor degrees of orientation and shrinkage and that the temperature range "near" was broad as well. However, upon review, the limitations directed to the degree of shrinkage and orientation from claim 22, if put into claim 20 would make claim 20 allowable. Mr. Bond approved the Exr. amendment..